



The Canadian Loyalists  
AND  
Early Settlers  
IN THE  
District of Bedford.

By Jno. P. Noyes,  
Gowansville, P. Q.

THE NEWS TYP., ST. JOHNS,  
1900.

With compliments of  
Wm. P. Jones

The Canadian Loyalists

AND

Early Settlers

IN THE

District of Bedford.

---

By Jno. P. Noyes,

Cowansville, P. Q.

---

THE NEWS TYP., ST. JOHNS,  
1900.

lo  
hi  
of  
ob  
fo  
on  
th  
in  
pl  
pa  
liv  
ca  
int  
th

## PREFATORY.

The following paper is published by request of officials of our local Historical Societies, and of friends interested in early pioneer history. It was originally read before historical and other societies of the District of Bedford during the past year. In the desire to obtain brevity, many local references to Missisquoi were omitted before Shefford audiences, just as those relating to Shefford were omitted before Missisquoi audiences. An effort is made to combine them in the following paper. Many things deemed necessary to interest the different audiences, as well as expressions peculiar to platform delivery, have been omitted. But the substance of the paper, and the historical facts and comments are the same as delivered. This statement is deemed prudent to allay the zeal of the captious local critic. The real object of the paper is to stimulate interest in the laudable designs of the County Historical Societies of the District of Bedford.

JNO. P. NOYES.

COWANSVILLE, August 1900.

P  
g  
fa  
fa  
ti  
re  
up

le  
en  
tic  
res  
Lo  
fac  
ne  
sk  
in  
ma  
ha  
tha  
rel  
for

# The Canadian Loyalists

and

## Early Settlers in the District of Bedford.

---

The early settlement of a country, the habits, hardships and experiences of its pioneers, have a charm for those—perhaps a select few—who delight in the investigation of a subject which exacts a certain amount of research in order to attain a fair measure of accuracy. There is a commendable tendency of late to regard with favor the economic, or political value of history, apart from its interest as a narrative of events, which should assist and stimulate investigation. There are obvious reasons for this, and it is quite clear, as well, that such value depends not only upon the truth of the narrative, but upon the fair appreciation of the facts.

The fitful, and, at times, acrimonious controversy of the past, as to the early settlers of the District of Bedford respecting loyalty, has obscured rather than enlightened the subject. There is no lack of traditions—of historical research and investigation in the true sense—in the historical sense, there has been practically none. One result is, that the zeal of uninformed partisans has led to the labelling as U. E. Loyalists, many who came after the fever of loyalty had been replaced by the factor of self-interest, and even of those whose arrival was long subsequent to the necessities of loyal expression. The result has been to create a feeling of doubt or skepticism, as to U. E. Loyalists akin to that expressed by the irreverent pilgrim in Rome, "These new saints make one doubt the old." It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that the unwarranted assertions of such ill-informed advocates have caused a generation, not keenly interested in the U. E. Loyalists, to surmise that these loyalists are an historical mystery, and as utterly discredited, so far as relates to location, as the descendants of the lost tribes of Israel. It is fortunate for those of another turn of mind, who desire historical accuracy, that the zeal and



industry of our Canadian Archivist have, within the past few years, procured a considerable quantity of the official records of the early settlement of the country, by means of which the trivial incidents of credulous or interested news gatherers, so zealously exploited heretofore as history, are shown to be valueless. The idle tales resulting from the creative fancy of man, called tradition, and which have unconsciously a tenacious hold upon even intelligent people, though the times are recent, and written records available, are, by means of these records, in a way to be dispelled. Carlyle calls history "the letter of instructions from the old generations to the new." Accepting that definition, it is the duty of the present generation to examine its letter of instructions, as contained in the official records, so as to place the pioneers of the District in their proper class. This involves an examination of their credentials, as well as the consideration of their antecedents, and of the causes and events which led to their coming, as well as their situation on arrival here.

It will scarcely be disputed that the early Canadian Loyalists sprang from an adventurous stock, whose escape from alleged old world persecutions to secure religious and political freedom in the new, in no way quenched their love of conflict, or dislike of any authority which they did not dominate. Apart from the official and interested classes, the mass of American Colonists on the eve of the American Revolution, were practically united in opposing the mother country. The leaders of the popular cause were able, tactful and daring. But candid American historians admit that they were leaders of a minority when it came to a final rupture. It was unfortunate for the royal cause that the loyal majority had, from among themselves, no leaders. The Colonial officials who, by nature of their positions, assumed to guide, if not to lead, were not in touch with the people, and were to some extent discredited by the antagonisms of long years of dispute between them as to Crown rights. The declaration of independence was the act of a Congress without legal authority. Bancroft, an American historian, said it was "nothing more solid than the unformed opinion of an unformed people."

The Colonists enrolled as soldiers on the side of the Crown exceeded 25,000, and, during the war, their homes were destroyed, their property confiscated and their families bitterly persecuted. Justice requires the admission that, in this, as in other civil wars, there were reprisals in which the Loyalists imitated the deplorable example of their adversaries. Feelings of intense bitterness and mutual hatred were created which, when the conflict ended, could not be dispelled, nor the desire for revenge allayed. The conquerors easily became persecutors. Despite the provisions of the treaty of peace, specially guaranteeing the protection of the property and rights of the Loyalists, many of the State Legislatures ordered confiscation of their property. Persecution was encouraged and upheld.

This persecution drove the loyal Colonists into exile. There was a tremendous rush into Canada and Nova Scotia, taxing severely the resources of those Colonies to meet the urgent necessities of those destitute and suffering exiles. And it is through the efforts of the government to aid those exiles, and to give them a permanent settlement, that one finds from the official records a recognition of different titles—titles which designate a division into three fairly marked classes. These classes seem at times to be fused or blended, but a little consideration will show a

marked difference in treatment, and a distinction to which practical effect was given by governmental action. It will be understood that prior to 1791 the Province comprised Upper and Lower Canada, in which, apart from the seigniories, the immense area of waste land belonged to the Crown. As they had no market value, a grant of land was an easy form of compensation. To locate the grounds and allot the settlers, a preliminary survey was the first step, and for many reasons the first grants were on the Bay de Chaleurs, and on the north banks of the St. Lawrence and the lakes, the loyalists being assembled at Quebec, Sorel and Montreal for transportation.

## I.

The first class to be considered was composed of English officials, and Colonial non-combatants who left the rebel colonies at the beginning of, or during the war. These men did not depreciate their merits or miseries. They had the art of so exposing their griefs and services as to meet, from a generous government, a fair measure of reward for fugitive loyalty. Early in 1782 an investigation showed that upwards of \$200,000 had been paid for the support of 315 refugee Loyalists, in London alone. This was apart from offices, pensions, and land grants bestowed. It was further shown as an instance of loyal thrift, that after the death of 25 of the number, their demise had been concealed, and the British Government had continued its generous relief to necessitous loyalty by paying for their support. When the British parliament met in 1783, after the close of the war, His Majesty in the speech from the throne said: "That a due and generous attention ought to be shown to those who have relinquished their properties or possessions from motives of loyalty to me, or attachment to the mother country." As a result of this suggestion a commission was issued to receive claims for losses from all classes of suffering Loyalists, which continued its work until 1788. Claims for the sum of \$50,410,941 were filed, on which was allowed and paid \$18,912,294, which was repudiated by indefensible pretexts by the American Government, though the losses were shown to be in violation of the Treaty of Peace. The mother country was generous to all that class of sufferers. The old Colonial office holders appear to have been a greedy lot, and difficult to satisfy. Their names cut a big figure in the official records for free grants of land. One sample will illustrate their character, selected because his covetous eye, having been cast upon our Townships, gives his greed a local color.

Abraham Cuyler was Postmaster at Albany, when the revolutionary struggle began, and being a Postmaster was naturally and officially loyal. He lost his office, and took the road of forced exile. He came to Canada, and later went to Cape Breton, and secured offices at different times, ranging from a modest Inspectorship to a Judgeship; had applied for a Customs appointment, and acted as Lieutenant-Governor, whilst keeping on file sundry claims for land and compensation. He did not get on well with the local powers, so he resigned from the Bench, and, the war being over, he pushed his claims for compensation in New York, as well as in London. From the latter place he wrote the Canadian authorities for a grant of the whole Township of Hemmingford, which not being conceded, he pointed out lands in Dunham, Stanbridge, Farnham, Shefford and Stanstead, for which he desired a grant. Then he turned up with a claim for a part of

Montreal, but as this had been regranted to a church, his family was given 3,600 acres of land elsewhere, as an equivalent for the church property. Later, as he appeared to want a farm of his own to carry on, and the land officials seeming by that time to have tired of his importunity, it was ordered that out of the disposable lands in Farnham, a grant should be given to Messrs. Cuyler and Allsopp. He and two of his sons, became Associates of the Township of Farnham, and received the usual allotments of grants as such. But as Mr. Allsopp had received prior grants, and Judge Gale had to take a mountain, and his wife's relations, swamps and ledges, towards their considerable shares therein, it may be fairly presumed, that the disposable Crown Lands in Farnham were exhausted before Judge Cuyler got into the precinct. What finally became of him I do not know, but one cannot help sadly reflecting, what an additional glory it would have been for Farnham, had Judge Cuyler been entombed within its borders, to excite, in later years, the grief and curiosity of searchers for job lots of U. E. Loyalists.

It is submitted, that the whole of this class, just considered, were not U. E. Loyalists. The Colonists were not enrolled as soldiers in the war, and the native born Englishmen were bound by the ties of birth and allegiance to be loyal without exacting compensation for fidelity to such ties,

## II

The second class of Loyalists comprised the Colonial soldiers enrolled in the army prior to the Treaty of Peace in 1783, and who came at once, with their families to Canada at the close of the war.

These men appear to have left at once without stopping to barter their allegiance. Large as their number was, the Crown was generous in granting them land, in conveying them to the places allotted for location, and in granting them temporary aid and subsistence. And to establish their identity, and to distinguish them from the Refugee Loyalists, for all time to come, the Government on the 9th November, 1789, by a minute of Council ordered, that : " All Loyalists who joined the Standard before the Treaty of Peace in 1783, and all children, and descendants of either sex, are to be distinguished by the letters 'U. E.' affixed to their names, alluding to the great principle of the unity of the Empire." It was further ordered, at the same time, that a Register should be kept so that their posterity might be discriminated from future settlers. It is reasonably certain that all did not register. The Ontario list, containing many Eastern Townships names, is procurable, but there is no special list for Quebec, because Loyalists were excluded from settlement on Crown Lands south of the St. Lawrence.

By the Order of Council we have a clear and authoritative definition of the Loyalists. It is not a courtesy title, nor gained by common repute. By it we find the distinguishing conditions of a U. E. Loyalist to be : 1. An enrollment as a Colonial soldier in the army during the war ; or 2. A descendant of such soldier. The descent from such soldier is not difficult to establish where there was an enrollment in the Register. The absence of registration creates a presumption against the claim to be a U. E. Loyalist, which cannot be overcome by a bare statement of such claim. Through ignorance of the Order in Council many have assumed that an early land grant must have been the reward of loyalty, and there

fore, an effective title to the distinction of being a U. E. Loyalist. But all these early land grants were not given on account of loyalty. The official definition should, however, determine the matter. The true U. E. Loyalist, as just pointed out, was a Colonial soldier who, as such, had suffered the hardships of actual war, and had been exposed to its perils and risks, during which he had been conscious of the persecutions and sufferings of family and friends at home. He had undergone the trials and miseries of deportation when the war closed, and had endured great privations for years thereafter through want of means, and by reason of remoteness from markets and civilization. It is manifestly unfair to class such men with those who had not borne arms, however much the latter may have suffered through persecution or otherwise. One cannot read without interest, to say the least, the painful records of those exiled Loyalists. Their primitive makeshifts may, to-day, excite a smile, but they do not lessen respect. Many instances of such makeshifts are recorded in local history, or have been handed down from generation to generation. Mr. Edward Harris, a descendant of a U. E. Loyalist, in a paper read before the Canadian Institute at Toronto in 1897, related one of those incidents, common to most of the early settlements in some respects, resulting from pioneer makeshifts, which deserves reproduction. He said that in 1794 his grandfather became the first settler in the Long Point country on the north shore of Lake Erie, having removed there from New Brunswick, where he had settled in 1783. "In the absence of all other clothing and supplies," he writes, "the less fortunate settlers, and as a rule, all the men, used the skins of animals. The girls, in mild weather, usually wore a buckskin slip. 'White goods,' were not known in those days. Miss Sally Sprague, a fine girl of 14 or 15 years, had been in my mother's kitchen with her parents and noticed washing going on in the usual way by boiling in soap and water. A few days after, Sally took advantage of her parents' absence to wash her only garment, the slip. This she did, by boiling it. We all know the action of water and heat on leather, and Sally had to retreat into the potato hole under the floor. When her parents returned they soon found the shrunken slip, and then the girl. She was brought down to my mother's house in a barrel, on an ox-team four miles, and temporarily clothed until more buckskin could be found. This Miss Sprague's grand-daughter is now Lady B. in England." This incident is also related in Dr. Ryerson's history of the U. E. Loyalists, with considerable difference as to particulars, although both he and Mr. Harris obtained their information from the same person.

### III.

The third class of Loyalists comprised those Colonial non-combatants who, with their families, left after the Treaty of Peace, at the conclusion of the Revolutionary war, through the fierce persecution which for a time followed.

That this class came to Canada a result of the merciless persecution before mentioned, is recorded in the histories of that period, is treasured among the annals of the people, and is borne out and fully verified by the official documents of that day. It is the principal, if not the sole ground upon which that large number of refugee Loyalists based their persistent claims for provisions, compensation and

land grants. They were quick to see the strength of the cry of persecuted loyalty, with a well disposed, and not severely critical Executive. But, as the Provincial authorities could not at once comply with all their urgent demands, there was grave dissatisfaction, followed by strong complaints. It was impossible for them to be patient, or to make any show of self-reliance, seeing that they had lost everything, and were in sore distress. They were not in a position of isolated independence, with sufficient means of support, which warranted their taking the stand of those early Connecticut settlers, who proclaimed that they would be governed by the laws of God—until they had time to make better. The official reports stated that those early Canadian settlers would make malignant representations against an angel; that some of them would not carry the chain to mark out their own lands, without exorbitant pay from the Government; that there was trickery in disposing of their lands and seeking further compensation; that there were land speculators and jobbers; that there were clamors, jealousies and grasping greed; that there was sedition, led by an unholy combination of a lawyer and an apothecary; that they had "to make magistrates out of men whom God Almighty never intended for the office, but it was Hobson's choice;" that there were many worthless characters among the arrivals, and that some of the settlers were indifferent. His Excellency, the Governor-General, finding that despite all efforts to satisfy everybody, the dissatisfaction and artifices continued, ordered the immediate discontinuance of provisions and aid to those who, from fickleness or languor, threw obstacles in the way of the general good. The history of those quarrels, between exiles and Executive, is not now really essential. It is mentioned to show the character of a class, which, coming so closely on the heels of the U. E. Loyalists, and like them receiving land grants, has found in our day people who rank them with those ancient worthies. The claims have even been extended to cover, as U. E. Loyalists, the calm and peaceful Quakers, forced into exile. The droll effect of placing the unwarlike Quaker in line with the essentially warlike U. E. Loyalist, because both received Crown bounties, does not seem to have occurred to them.

An incident of that time, which the Canadian archivist says he has never seen referred to by an American historian, and which is recalled by allusion to Quakers, is interesting, as showing a peculiarity of those early Loyalists, though not otherwise in line with my subject. The small Island of Nantucket, off the coast of the Massachusetts coast, is said to have been inhabited in 1785 by Quakers connected with the whale fisheries. In that year they gravely proposed to separate from Massachusetts, and become a neutral state, or, failing in this, to become an appendage of Great Britain. The newly arrived Loyalists in Nova Scotia successfully opposed the scheme on the ground "That in that case all the whale oil from the Northern States would pass through Nantucket, as the product of the industry of British subjects, and be admitted into Great Britain free of duty, to the ruin of the same trade carried on from Nova Scotia." The thrifty and sagacious Quakers may have had in view the advantages of their position, as a point for smuggling rather than any possible benefit to the Empire, by adding their island thereto. If so, they were checkmated by the foresight of the Loyalists. This,

however, seems to be the first record of the adoption of the National Policy in Canada, and should set at rest all recent claims as to its paternity.

After these digressions we come back to this third Loyalist class, who have themselves prepared the record which excludes them from the slightest consideration as U. E. Loyalists. The only reason they gave, at the time for coming to Canada, and the only reason ever given on their behalf is, that after the Treaty of Peace, they were grievously persecuted and driven into exile. What those refugee Loyalists, in effect, said, was this: "We desired to stay in our old homes and retain our property; to do this we were willing to change our allegiance, to surrender the position of British subjects and become citizens of the Republic; but our inclinations and good will were rejected; they persecuted us, confiscated our property and drove us into unwilling exile; therefore we come to you and ask for a land grant, on the score of loyalty, and compensation for losses suffered, because not allowed to change our allegiance." It is clear they would have remained, if allowed to do so. Hence, their loyalty was not spontaneous, or disinterested. Go they must and go they did, and naturally made the best of a bad bargain, by getting as much compensation as possible, out of the Crown.

Whilst it is essential to the truth of history that the facts should be stated, it is not necessary to harshly judge those unfortunate and impoverished exiles. The colonies were their homes. There they were born and reared. There were ties of race, kindred, laws, institutions and religion common between them and the successful Colonists in the war. Together they had worshipped at the same altar, shared the vicissitudes and perils of Colonial existence, and borne the burdens and enjoyed the comforts and pleasures of civil and social life in their several communities. The change to them from a colony to an independent nation, accustomed as they had been to a considerable measure of local self-government, would not be so sudden or distinct as it would have been, had not these conditions existed, or had they been conquered by an alien race. It is evident, as well, that the British Government had contemplated their so remaining, inasmuch as the treaty of peace expressly provided for the protection of their property and rights. The subsequent evasion of the treaty could not have been foreseen. Nevertheless, we must be careful not to unduly magnify the passive position of neutrals in a civil war, into the highest kind of patriotism and loyalty, by shouldering them into the ranks of those who risked their lives, as well as their fortunes, as loyal soldiers of their Sovereign, as did the genuine U. E. Loyalist.

A fertile source of error respecting the old Loyalists comes from the long, alphabetically arranged, and frequently repeated lists of applicants for lands, contained in several years reports of the Dominion Archives. These are apt to mislead, and, in fact, have misled many, as to the quality of those therein named. A very little investigation, and comparison of dates, will show that those lists comprise the old Associates, who were the pioneers and actual settlers of the Eastern Townships, and who obtained their lands long after the U. E. and other Loyalists had been definitely located elsewhere. They were, on the whole, an absolutely different class from the old Loyalists, or any other, or later class of settlers. The error as to the Associates has been greatly helped along by the persistent claims of



recent partisans, by the eulogies of local biographers exalting the dead, to propitiate the living, and by taking early residence, loyalty, land grants and U. E. Loyalists as synonymous or convertible terms. The placing of the associates in the old Loyalist class which preceded them, does them an injustice, for the Associates, being more self-reliant, possessed of some means, and not dependent upon Government bounty, were a better class of settlers to develop a new country than the old Loyalists could have been, had they settled here, as a little consideration will show. For several years after the treaty of peace in 1783 our government positively refused permission to settle along the border. After 1791, when the Province was divided into Upper and Lower Canada, the policy was changed so as to induce English speaking settlers to locate, and settle on the Crown lands in the Eastern Townships, then unsurveyed, and a survey was the first preliminary to a grant. The intentions of the government were widely disseminated in New England—where over 150 years of settlement had exhausted the market for farm lands—in order to attract, as settlers, those desiring to secure good lands for settlement, on easy conditions. So early as 1788 the advantages had been urged of getting from New England a class of settlers, who had repented of their hostility to the British Government. The new policy comprised an organization, or company, called Associates, to whom the new Township was granted. The agent of the Associates, called the leader, was usually a man with some means and influence. He became responsible for the fulfillment of the conditions, the only one of the many really pressed being the cost of the primitive survey, which had to be made as a preliminary to the erection of the Township, and the granting of the lands. The Associates, with remarkable uniformity, alleged prior attachment, or repentance of hostility, which, as they had originally been British subjects, involved no severe moral strain. Besides, the war in New England, from whence they mostly came, had been on its outskirts, so that those living inland in the '90's had probably never borne arms on either side. The Government took no sentimental view of the matter, and accepted means and character as conditions, more than professed prior allegiance, or sorrow for hostility. The fact is, the Government wanted settlers; the settlers wanted lands. Under such conditions, no technical or sentimental considerations were likely to be an obstacle in the way of an agreement between the parties. Some of the leaders and Associates were business men, who went into the undertaking for speculative motives, or to make up the required number, and who disposed of their interests and never came, nor intended to come, at all. After the survey, the Township was erected, given a name, and the lands allotted to the Associates by grant. Thus Dunham was created in 1796, Potton, Bolton, and Brome in 1797, Farnham in 1798, Stanbridge in 1801, and so on up to 1807, when a halt was called. St. Armand, St. George de Clarenceville and St. Thomas were created Seigniories prior to the conquest—and not being Crown lands, could not be granted or made Townships. Governor Prescott, a few years after the adoption of the policy in question, divided the Associates into three classes: 1. People who had always been attached to the British cause; 2. People who have been led astray; and 3. Mere speculators, whose applications he said were numerous. He complained bitterly to the home Government of the attempts of the speculators to obtain large grants in order to create a monopoly; of straw men being put up as

applicants to evade the regulations; of the complicity of members of his own council in the schemes; of collusive tricks with land surveyors to further their plans, and the dissatisfaction of these land jobbers, as Chief Justice Monk called them, when their plans were thwarted. In the Upper Province they were having their troubles, for, in 1802, an official classified the later refugee settlers from the U. S. as: 1. Those enticed by a gratuitous offer of land without any predilection for the British constitution; 2. Those who had fled from the U. S. for crimes or to escape their creditors; and 3. Republicans who came as settlers, to plot against Great Britain. The Associates were of a better class of men than these, but were not of the Loyalist class mentioned, which came at the close of the war, as a little consideration will show. A period of about 13 years intervened between the treaty of peace and the grant of the first Township to the Associates. The bitter, and general persecution following the close of the war, as before mentioned, drove into exile every man suspected of attachment to the mother country. This long period is conclusive that those Associates who came on the creation of the Townships must, during their residence for so many years in their old homes, have satisfied the local authorities there, of their satisfaction with, and allegiance to, the new order of things. Had they not done so, it is certain that they could not thus have remained among a people on the alert for British sympathizers, and against whom that people were violently enraged.

This long residence, where the authorities exacted active and open, and would not tolerate passive allegiance to the new nation, dispels any possible illusion as to loyalty to the Crown. Its tardy manifestation, until stimulated by self-interest, is incompatible with loyal sincerity, or consistent with the active vigilance of Americans towards suspected Loyalists. A loyalty which is dormant, or lingering, until spurred into action by the prospect of material advancement is not generally thought to be of the highest order, or to contain the elements from which true patriotism springs. But whatever face the Provincial authorities may have put upon formal professions, it is evident, from the official documents, that they looked upon them as a good natured contrivance, and were not deceived as to their value. They were quite content to receive a good class of settlers, on their own rating, without minutely scanning motives.

Running over the list of Associates, a similarity of well known names, combined with parity of objects, creates a presumption that some of the old classes of loyalists had gone astray, or had been belated in receiving grants, and had joined the Associates, as their last chance. Their recognized loyal quality, through early arrival, would tend to aid, materially, the Associates in obtaining Township charters and allotment of lands, but there were not many of them at the best.

There also appear, now and then, isolated specimens of the old Colonial English officials who may have cast in their lot with the Associates, for the reason before maintained. A case in point, and close at hand, is that of the late Samuel Gale, whose local title of Judge Gale, it will do no harm to accept. The decay of his tombstone in East Farnham seems, at irregular intervals of time, to excite the grief of the casual and curious visitor, and as the trembling fingers push aside the moss from the epitaph commemorating departed virtues and greatness, a new rule of historical interpretation dawns upon the saddened mind, and Judge Gale is pro-



moted to the U. E. Loyalist class, to which he has no more right than to that of Judge. There are insurmountable objections to his being so considered. The true U. E. Loyalist was a native born Colonial soldier, or the descendant of one. Judge Gale was neither. He was an English Colonial official of the non-combatant type, then a refugee, and later an Associate. Born, reared and educated in England, he came to the Colonies in 1770, secured a public office and was married. When the revolution came, his remarks were not appreciated; they raised a prejudice against him. One of his biographers says: "He may have overstepped the bounds of a calculating prudence." After release on parole from imprisonment, he joined the British Army near New York in 1776, and for several years performed clerical duties as cashier and itinerant paymaster for the army, and came to Canada a few years after the close of the war. In a memorial to the British authorities in 1787, he refers to these things: to his loss of office and its profits, to the confiscation of his property, and prayed therein, "for such relief as may appear proportionate to what may have been granted to other suffering Loyalists, who likewise served *"in departments of trust in the civil branches of the army."* The civil branch is not the fighting branch of an army. For himself, Judge Gale never claimed to have been a soldier, or a U. E. Loyalist. Had he borne arms, it would have been mentioned in his memorial. After his arrival he was given an office, and in 1798 he became leader of the Associates of the Township of Farnham, receiving a land grant. His kind solicitude for his wife's collateral kin—and there were ten in the family—procured each of them considerable grants. He had lofty ideas, among them being the desire to establish in Farnham a family estate, after the English pattern, with tenants, dogs and all the baronial fixtures. But in a new country where salts was the leading industry, neat cattle current money, and the hospitable stimulant for lordly revelry was distilled from the succulent potato, he had to content himself with a coat of arms, and a local title conferred by neighbors, prudently anxious to propitiate the only man in the settlement who had a grindstone. Having started early in life as a public officer, and followed in that line for many years, he hankered in his rural retirement for public position, and as he could not be a Duke, he was appointed a notary public, then, as now, an office of mystery, honor and emoluments. With this office, and the opportunity of rendering valuable services to the early settlers, he closed an eventful life. But, after all, is it a surprising thing that, in a time of peril, Judge Gale remained true to his Sovereign rather than become an ally of the rebels? Had he followed ancient precedent in preferring pottage to birthright, and cast in his lot with the rebel Colonists, he would justly be held up to scorn, as a traitor to his sovereign. Being an Englishman he was loyal, and those who now claim a special distinction for him on that score, do his memory a gross injustice, and display ignorance of the English character. It is an indirect way of saying that English loyalty is a subject of dicker, and barter, fidelity to allegiance an unusual incident, and an Englishman's patriotism based upon expectation of reward. The end of the question is, however, that he does not come within the terms of the Order in Council as to U. E. Loyalists.

In studying the question of early settlement one may well keep in mind that it was about 13 years after the location of the Loyalists before the first Township

was created, and granted to the Associates; that a survey was an essential prior condition to a grant; that the want of such survey is conclusive against a grant; that the Government had forbidden settlement on the border; that the terms and conditions of the grants to the U. E. Loyalists differed from those to the Associates, and that the Order in Council absolutely settles the matter.

Whilst it is perfectly clear that the first settlers in the Townships, as a whole, were not the old Loyalists, but the Associates, as before stated, yet it would seem that a few stubborn men pitched their tents in the Seigniories when and where there were no owners on the spot to warn them off, and from thence importuned the Government for permission to settle therein, on and about Missisquoi Bay. This was firmly, and at times angrily refused, the Government offering them lands elsewhere, where the Crown owned the lands; and on refusal they were officially warned that their provision allowances would be cut off—a more serious matter about the Bay in 1784 than in 1900. Finally, the Governor General ordered their houses to be destroyed, and the settlers sent for location to St. Johns, which, even then, was called “a cursed place.”

Dr. Brymner, the Dominion Archivist, has kindly furnished me with extracts from the official orders, on file in his Department, relating to the discontinuance of His Majesty's bounty of provisions for the winter, at Missisquoi Bay, as well as a memorial from the settlers there, to the Government in reference to the same subject, whereby it is shown that effect was given to the apparently harsh orders. The memorial is quoted in full, among other things, because it shows the action of the Executive, as well as the prior condition, and the then pressing needs of the settlers, and, in addition, has a quaint flavor, which gives it a peculiar interest. The lavish use of capital letters and peculiarities of spelling and punctuation therein cannot be justly attributed to disrespect or disloyalty. The English lacks the finish and perfection which are considered indispensable by the best writers of our day, but then there is no doubt as to the object. The charges of fraud and underhand dealing are ambiguous only as to identity of the parties whose names are suppressed. In our day, Ragged Philosopher would solve the difficulty by inserting the familiar names of “Wilfie,” or “Dickey,” or “Joey,” or other symbolic terms, by which he playfully represents certain phases of human depravity in the criminal exercise of political functions.

The Memorial is as follows:

‘*To His Excellence Henry Hammelton, Esqr., Governor in and over the Province of Quebec and Territorys thereunto belonging, &c., &c., &c.*

“*The Petition of the Subscribers humbly sheweth*

“That the fift day of Octr. in the Year of our Lord, 1783, we, with many otheres Petitioned His Excellency Fridrick Haldemand, Esqr., the then Governor, and Commander in Chief, for a tract of land East of Missisquie Bay, for Each of us there to recive his Portion of land, allowed by Government for services but not Reciveing an Answer to our Petition untill late in the Winter Fallowing, and we being Desireous, to Git in some way of Liveing again, and to retrive a little of our Losses (by Cultivation) which we snffered During the unhappy troubles in North America which losses were very considerable with some of us, and Very Sorely Feel'd by Every One of us and Your humble Petitioners, would not be

"under the necessity of troubling you, had they at present what they have lost, and were obliged to leave in the hands of the Enemy, since they from the beginning of the late troubles in America, adhered to British Government, and joined the British Forces in the Year 1777, but since, as above mentioned, were desirous to get into some way of living, we bought a tract of land of Mr. Robertson of St. Johns, and some of us settled thereon before Ever his Excellence Fridrick Haldemand, Esqr., the late Commander in Chief had Given Orders or Pointed out Places for the settling of Loyalists, but so it was, that since some of us had settled at the Bay of Missisquie, and Others Could not move, when the orders came out for to settle at the appointed Places, by Reason of Sickness, and Other hindrance in their Families, and all of us hoping that we should Yet Get the land in the Parts we Petitioned for, but so it was, since we did not Go, to the Place or Places pointed at, we were struck off the Provisions list, part of us since the 24th of May last, the Others at Different times After, but all of us since the 24th Octr. last. Wherefore we most Humbly beg your Excellence in your Clemency, and love to Your Fellow Men, who have sorely suffered During the late Rebellion both in body and Estate, and Order that the Provision and Other Donations Allowed to Loyalists, by Government, Should be Given to us from the time that Every one of us, and Families were struck off the Provision list. And we humbly beg Your Excellence will Please to Condesend, to favour us with an Answer, Withere we Shall have Provision, Or no, for it is our Opinion that all loyalists, Settling in the Province of Quebec, are Allowed Provision wethere on Kings land or, not, if within the Province line, Moreover, we humbly beg to inform Your Excellence, that we little Expected, Nithere do we think, that it is Governments intention or any Order, from our Most Gracious King, and his Perilment, that all such of his true and faithfull Subjects as Your Petitioners, Should be strue off of all bennefits from Government, as Donation of Provs, and Other Things, allowed by Govert. Except such and only such, who settle in them Particular Places, which Perhaps through the Indication of Selfe intersted Gentlemen, has been Put into the head of the late Commander in Chief, to Point out for Settling of the Loyalists in the province of Quebec, Furthere more, we doubt, Yea we are most sure, that there is some underhanded Dealing with the Kings Provs, by them who have the posts for Giveing Orders for the loyalists Provs, as for instance at St. Johns, &c., For we sent a Petition to Your Excellence Decr. last, and Never hear'd thereof, Wherefore we beg Your Excellence will Please to Condesend to Derect Your Answer to Chn. Wehr Lieut Late Royl. Yorkers at Missisquie Bay, and to the care of Mr. Alexr. Taylor at St. Johns, and if Your Excellence will most Graciously Please to Grant us our Petition, Your Petitioners as in Duty bound Shall Ever Pray.

" (sd) CHRISTIAN WEHR,  
 " CONRADE BEST,  
 " CHRISTIAN MAVER,  
 " JOHN RUTER,  
 " ADAM DEAL,  
 " JOHN COLE,  
 " LUDWIG STREIT,  
 " GEORGE FELLER.

" (sd) JOSAMIND DROW,  
 " LODWIK STRIT, Junr,  
 " JACOB THOMAS,  
 " PHILIP RUTER,  
 " JOHN VAN VORST,  
 " JAMES HENDERSON,  
 " ALEXR. TAYLOR,

" Missisquie Bay, Feb. 7th, 1785."

The names of most of the signers of this pathetically indignant memorial bear the earmark of Teutonic origin, although some of the expressions have a distinctively Hibernian flavor. Dr. Brynmmer says, that among all the documents relating to Missisquoi Bay, that memorial is the only one which contains a list of names and adds: "Nearly all of whom, I am aware, fought during the war as loyalists." The pressing importance of the matters referred to in the memorial is sufficient to warrant the presumption, that all the people there at that time, affixed their signatures. The untenable possession of these Loyalists, as shown by their memorial, does not justify a claim at this time of a general settlement, nor warrant the pretension that their temporary sojourn in a seigniory, by itself, establishes an early settlements as U. E. Loyalists in the Townships of this District.

Of the signers of that memorial a few can be found among the Associates, for instance, Adam Deal, Ludwig Streit and Philip Ruiter in Dunham in 1796; the same Adam Deal and also Alexander Taylor and Christian Wehr in Sutton in 1797, and in the same year, Philip Ruiter in Potton. There were other Ruiteres of the same stock and class among the Associates in Dunham, Potton and Stanbridge, as well as six children of John Ruiter in Roxton. The Ruiteres seem to have prospered despite the drawback of having owned lands in Roxton.

The early settlements in Missisquoi and Brome Counties ran along nearly the same lines, at about the same dates, and among much the same class of settlers, but it was different in the County of Shefford.

The Township of Farnham, east and west parts, and the Township of Brome were within the limits of Shefford County until disconnected in the '50's on the formation of Brome County at the expense of Stanstead, Shefford and Missisquoi Counties. After prior survey, the Townships of the County of Shefford were created as follows: Stukely in 1800; Shefford in 1801, Ely in 1802, and Granby, Milton and Roxton in 1803. The leader of the Associates in Stukely was Samuel Willard, an influential man in his day, who has still many descendants in the Townships and in the Company of Associates are the well known names of Knowlton, Lawrence, Sargent and Page, also well represented by local descendants. The long period which had elapsed between the close of the war and their arrival indicates that they did not deliberate in haste, nor should the coincidence of a land grant be construed as a motive for quickened loyalty. The leader of the Associates of the Township of Ely was Amos Lay, jr., a land surveyor, who was granted one-fourth of the Township, much of which passed to his son, the late Dr. Amos W. Lay, who resided there for many years prior to his death. Gov. Prescott, in a letter to the home authorities in 1798, detailing at some length the fraudulent schemes to obtain Crown Lands, appears to approve of a movement, of which he gives the copy of an advertisement published in Vermont and other States, inviting applications for lands in the Townships. This advertisement was given by Amos W. Lay, jr., co-operating with Capt. Ruiter of Missisquoi, to obtain members for Companies of Associates. Shortly prior to the first settlement in Ely, a land surveyor by the name of Trenholme met a tragic death near what is now known as Dalling, in the north part of the Township, where he was surveying with a party. A fire they had kindled in the forest burnt off the roots of a tree, which, during

the night fell upon and instantly killed Mr. Trenholme. He was the grandfather of Dr. N. W. Trenholme, of Montreal, and of Rev. Mrs. Fessenden, of Hamilton, whose zealous work in creating Empire Day has gained well deserved recognition.

There are some indications pointing to a member of the Ruiter family as the leader of the Associates of the Township of Roxton. There has been no rush to obtain credit for the position. No one has clamored for the honor, or even for that of first settler, though it has usually been the home of statesmen. Half a century ago or thereabouts, all the poor land was owned by the British American Land Company, from which it might be inferred that it was practically sole proprietor. The first settlements were made about 1834.

Granby and Milton were largely granted to discharged soldiers and militiamen, about one hundred of the latter locating in Granby, which may account for its martial spirit ever since. The descendants of the original grantees of Milton, which was not much, if any, settled until about 1830, have disappeared from its limits.

More local history pervades the early settlement of Shefford at the commencement of the century, at least more available local history, than of the other Townships of the County.

The leader of the Associates of Shefford Township was Capt. John Savage from the Hudson or Mohawk Valley of New York, with whom, as Associates, were two other John Savages and a Peter Savage, relatives, and the well known names of Wood, Hayes, Ketzback, Lawrence, Lewis, Bell, Moffatt, and McFarland. John Savage, leader, made his first visit to Shefford in 1792, having come to Canada by way of Lake Champlain in 1783. Capt. Savage and his Associates had a narrow escape from the wiles of land grabbers and officials who, by imposing severe conditions, and conspiring with surveyors, usually forced money or land from Associates or so discouraged them that they threw up their applications. Simon Z. Watson, land surveyor, employed to make the primitive survey, discovered the attempts to rob Capt. Savage and his Associates without their knowledge, and thereupon threw up his job, and made a deposition exposing the tricks, which he forwarded to the Governor-General, who, in communicating it to the English Colonial authorities said: "The imbecility shown in the practical working "of the plans of the monopolists does not lessen the existence of the plans themselves." Had these plotters succeeded the settlement of Shefford would probably have been as long deferred as Ely and Roxton. Whilst the official records speak of Capt. Savage and Squire Savage, it is probable that both titles belonged to the same man, one for warlike, and the other for civil distinction. In his petition to the Government in 1792 for compensation for losses, he alleged his services as an officer in a New York Colonial corps during the Revolution. His quality was accepted by the Government, but the grant to him later was as an Associate. In 1783 a report from a frontier post says: "Wright has returned with "two brothers Savage, who have come to look for an asylum for a great number "of loyalists, who are determined to leave a country wholly under the direction of "the oppressors." Capt. Savage went on from that border post to St. Johns. An official report from that post on the frontier said, that the people on the American side were very insulting in their remarks, but in a broad spirit of magnanimity,



the officials said they regarded it as merely "the mad sallies of vulgar fools," which may not have been too severe. The same official report as to Savage states that Messrs. Campbell and Huntington, two ruined loyalists had arrived, followed by a Mr. Wirt, who demanded their return to Boston. Mr. Huntington remained in Canada, but a little later Campbell went back with Savage and Ira Allen to Vermont, to aid in settling loyalists there, pursuant to a scheme of Allen's. It soon became clear that this was a dodge of Allen's to incite Congress to admit Vermont into the Union, and thereupon they abandoned the crafty Allen. The Mr. Huntington referred to was probably a relative, or ancestor, of the late Hon. Lucius Seth Huntington, who represented Shefford for so many years in Parliament. It was well known that he was of U. E. Loyalist stock, though it had not become a habit in his day to boast of it ostentatiously.

The early history of Shefford Township is the history of the Savage family. It was the dominant family in its early settlement, and even up to the middle of the century, but only a few are now left there. They were of Dutch descent, though the name creates a difficulty. It may have been Americanized and toned down from a Dutch name, as have the Churches and Pickels of Dunham, who in the Dutch dialect were respectively Schurz and Puyckel, or something like. It has also been said that in an early day an Irishman named Savage married a Dutch girl in the Dutch settlements of New York, and hence the name. This does not seem unreasonable when we consider the not unremarkable propensity of Irishmen to commit matrimony, and the facility with which the Dutch absorb the assimilated races. But all this may be left to a future historian of Shefford or of the Savage family.

---

In the use of the term, "Early Settlers," in this paper, its meaning is properly restricted to those who received free grants of land from the Crown. However commendable may have been the enterprise and virtues of those who "bought in," so to speak, they have no special claim for consideration on the score of loyalty beyond earlier, or even later settlers. Nor can it reasonably be assumed that, because a few Loyalists strayed from the place where the Government had located them, and subsequently acquired lands in the Townships as Associates, or by purchase, a claim of general settlement by U. E. Loyalists in any locality can be justified or supported. It is not, however, discreditable to those old U. E. Loyalists that so many in our day are eager to claim descent from them. It is an excellent testimonial of their worth. It appears to be akin to the claim of Puritan descent in New England, or Norman descent in Old England, and exposed to the same scoffs and suspicions on the part of those not of the blood.

But when one casts a retrospective glance over the history of the settlement and development of this District, and of its first settlers and their successors, one readily sees that a fair and moderate view is essential, and that to discriminate is impolitic and unjust. The old Associates were the true pioneers, who began the forest clearing epoch without relying upon Government bounty for provisions or aid. And after them, in the 20's, or about that time there came from New England its surplus of skilled mechanics and tradesmen, and even professional men, who,

with their trained skill and larger means, placed their little shops and mills and foundries and tanneries on every convenient water-power and thereby aided in extending the good work began by those old Associates. Is it not largely from the descendants of that later class that have come the men whose business capacity and enterprise have done so much to build up these Eastern Townships. Nor will it be forgotten that through all the years, people of other races, and people from the old world have filtered into these Townships, assimilated with the older stocks, and aided in advancing its prosperity. Hence, the wisdom or expediency of unduly exalting one class more than another is questionable, though, as an abstract historical question there may be, and are, good reasons for judicious investigation. But, however, this may be, we cannot honestly forget that it is from the feeble, remote and scattered settlements which those hardy pioneers created about a century ago, that have come material prosperity, and the comforts of civilization, which we, of this generation, so fully possess and enjoy. We should treasure with honest appreciation the memories of those robust men of the olden time, who did so much under adverse conditions and trying circumstances to build up our country so that life for us is more tolerable, and the future full of encouragement. It is to be regretted that the only phase of the personal life of those early pioneers can only be gathered from dry official records, dealing with the wants and conditions of material existence. No historian recorded their acts, nor poet portrayed their sentiments in verse.



mills and  
led in ex-  
from the  
capacity  
Nor wil  
ople from  
er stocks,  
y of un-  
abstract  
tigation.  
eeble, re-  
a century  
n, which  
h honest  
so much  
y so that  
o be re-  
only be  
tions of  
ed their